

## **R E M A R K S**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action mailed on March 11, 2010.

The March 11, 2010 Office Action rejects claims 12-18, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) over US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0271194 to Woods, et al. (Woods) in view of US Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0118175 to Meyerson (Meyerson) and rejects claims 19-21 under §103(a) over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of US Patent No. 6,216,339 to Rich (Rich).

In response to the rejections over Woods in view of Meyerson, applicants have amended independent claims 12 and 23 to add a feature that the discussion unit further comprises a casing and a configuration switch for configuring the discussion unit to operate in one of the operating modes, including that the configuration switch is accessible only when the casing is in a disassembled state.

Support for the modification to claims 12 and 23 is found in the Specification at page 8, lines 5-15.

Independent claim 22 is amended to qualify that the at least one exchangeable control comprises a split push-button, offering at least two separate control features.

Support for the modification to claim 22 is found in claim 18.

Neither Woods nor Meyerson teach or suggest a discussion unit having a casing and a configuration switch for configuring the discussion unit to operate in one of the operating modes, including that the configuration switch is accessible

only when the casing is in a disassembled state (claims 12 and 23), nor a set wherein the at least one exchangeable control comprises a split push-button, offering at least two separate control features (claim 22).

Hence, independent claims 12, 22 and 23, and claims 13-18 (19, 20) that depend from claim 12, are patentable over Woods in view of Meyerson under §103(a), and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections thereunder.

In response to the rejections over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of Rich, applicants have amended independent claim 21 is amended to further qualify that the ejector tool has a tool element configured with two parallel arms for pushing a pair of pins comprising the at least one exchangeable control, which pair of pins are inserted in ejector openings within the casing, in order to eject and remove the at least one exchangeable control from the casing.

Support for the modification to claim 21 is found in the Specification at page 8, lines 28 to 32.

None of Woods, Meyerson or Rich disclose an ejector tool having a tool element configured with two parallel arms for pushing a pair of pins comprising the at least one exchangeable control, which pair of pins are inserted in ejector openings within the casing, in order to eject and remove the at least one exchangeable control from the casing (claim 21).

Hence, independent claim 21, and claims 19 and 20, are patentable over Woods in view of Meyerson further in view of Rich under §103(a), and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections thereunder.

Accordingly, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 27,233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631 549 4700